PEPS 18-3707 Approved For Release 2000 650 CTA-HIEF 30 16 Roll of 0000001-4

78-11876/12

MEMORANDUM FOR: Deputy Director of Central Intelligence

: Deputy Director for Administration VIA

DD/A Registry
File Persannel-12 : F. W. M. Janney FROM Director of Personnel

Inter-Directorate Rotational Assignment SUBJECT

Program

1. Action Requested: This memorandum is a progress report for your information. It also contains options for your consideration in paragraph 2e.

## 2. Background:

a. Attached is a summary of the status of the Inter-Directorate Rotational Assignment Program (IDRAP) which you outlined in your 18 May 1978 memorandum to the Deputy Directors and Chairman, Executive Career Service Board. The position information was to be submitted to the Director of Personnel by 16 June 1978 with the nominees to be submitted at a later date. As you are aware, the last of the position information was not submitted until early September at which time you asked the Career Services to submit their nominees for the positions to the Office of Personnel by 13 October 1978.

b. Once all the nomination information was received and the files of the 60 persons obtained, each of the three Placement Officers in the Professional Placement Branch of the Staff Personnel Division were assigned one-third of the nominees to review. Each file was carefully reviewed against the position description information provided by the Career Services, taking into account the employee's work experience, educational background, training and performance record. When this initial review was completed, the Chief of the Professional Placement Branch then reviewed all the files and the positions for which the candidates were nominated in light of the conclusions reached by the Placement Officers. Where differences of opinion occurred, the Chief, PPB discussed the case with the officer so that the final conclusions are the consensus of at least two Officers.

# Approved For Release Truitish 2 CA-RD 100142R000B00050001-4

- c. As you will note from the attached, we recommend 24 of the 67 nominations for 17 of the 21 positions for which nominations were made. For four positions, our conclusion was that none of the six nominees matched the requirements of the position closely enough to be recommended for consideration. In the 33 cases where we concluded that the nominees should not be recommended, the reasons for the conclusions were varied; e.g., the nominees did not possess the extensive knowledge of the Agency or of a particular facet required by the position; or they did not have the writing or briefing skills asked for; or they lacked knowledge of or exposure to certain techniques required, etc. While we could conclude in many cases that the individuals recommended, although lacking some of the factors deemed necessary by the components, could probably learn the job, we opted for trying to match qualifications as closely as possible rather than rely on a judgment of potential to learn based only on feelings obtained from reading files.
- d. NFAC did an excellent job on their submission, providing clear position information and helpful information about the reasons for their nominations. Their nominees were in the suggested grade range (GS-13-GS-15) and all but three who had recently been promoted to GS-13 were from their PDP. (We agreed with 63% of their nominees -- 9 of 14.) The other Services did less well, providing either outdated or incomplete position information, nominees who were non-PDP or outside the grade range, or no information regarding their reasons for the nominations. While some of the Services sought sub-group nominations and then selected the final nominees at the Career Service level, others "advertised" the program and sought volunteers. The lack of good information on many of the positions undoubtedly made it difficult for the Career Services to do as thorough a job on their selections as they would have had all the position information been of good quality. Possibly as a result of this, 18 (or 30%) of the nominees within the grade range were not on the Career Service's PDP (excluding the nine GS-12 employees who, at that grade, are not covered by PDP). Thus, it appears possible that the importance and level of this program might not have been fully understood by the Career Services.
- e. In view of the foregoing, we suggest that the following options are available:
  - 1. Hold the nominations for the 17 positions and ask the Career Services to identify other, more fillable positions to replace the nine for which no nominations were made, and to identify other candidates for the four positions for which we are not recommending any of the nominees.

# Approved For Release 2001/05/01 CIA-RDP81-00142R000500050001-4

- Forward the nominations for the 17 positions and, at the same time, ask the Career Services for positions and candidates as in 1. above.
- 3. Implement the program for this year with the 17 positions for which there are candidates with the understanding that the Career Services will be required to provide more easily fillable positions, clearer job information, and candidates who more closely match the requirements next year.
- Recommendation: Option 3. would be the one which would implement the program most quickly while Option 2. would ultimately take longer but would effect a more complete result.

(organis) in it. M. daniel

F. W. M. Janney

#### Attachment

#### DISTRIBUTION:

Original - Addressee 1 - ER

2 - DDA

1 - D/Pers

1 - SPD

1 - PPB

\$TATINTL OP/SPD/PPB/

h:mlm/3404 (17 Nov 78)

## Administrative - Internal Use Only

Approved For Release 2001/05/01 : CIA-RDP81-00142R000500050001-4

#### IDRAP

### Statistical Summary

- I. 30 jobs (7 in each directorate and 2 in the E Career Service)
- II. 60 people nominated 7 for two jobs for a total of 67 nominations. (E 1; DDA 8; NFAC 14; DDO 10; DDS&T 27)
- III. Nominations received for 21 jobs (no nominees for 9)
  - IV. Grade range of jobs GS-13-15. Grade range of nominees - GS-12-16.
    - V. 33 nominees on PDP list. 27 nominees not on PDP list. (9 GS-12s)
  - VI. Of the 67 nominations for 21 jobs, we recommend 34 for 17 jobs.
- VII. Of the remaining 4 jobs, we recommend none of the 6 nominees.